

who have been displaced in this conflict. Those who have survived have the scars of watching their relatives and neighbors murdered, raped, and subjected to other horrors we cannot imagine.

For the hundreds of thousands of people who fled to Chad, the terror continues as they face new attacks in this expanding conflict. Samantha Power, who is a Pulitzer Prize winning expert on genocide, has pointed out that many women face the essence of a Sophie's choice: They can either leave their villages and camps to gather firewood, facing the likelihood of rape or attack by the jingawit, or starve inside the camp.

It is in this dire context that the World Food Program announced that it would be forced to cut the rations to feed those who are affected by the conflict in Darfur. This means people already facing a humanitarian crisis will now only receive half of the recommended level of calories per day. Even worse are reports that at least 200,000 people have been displaced since January, and that many of those cannot be reached or helped by aid agencies.

A recent article in the New York Times quoted one senior humanitarian aid official as saying:

The situation for humanitarian workers and the United Nations has never been as bad as it is now. The space for us to work is just getting smaller and smaller.

Not surprisingly, the Sudanese Government, which is supporting the groups that conduct this campaign of death and destruction, continues to hinder any attempts by the international community to assess the situation and provide aid to the millions of refugees. Just this month, the Sudanese Government denied entry into the country to Mr. Jan Egeland, a top U.N. official on humanitarian issues. Last week, Sudan refused to grant visas to officials who intended to conduct a U.N. military assessment on planning a peacekeeping operation in Darfur.

So in a region the size of Texas, 7,000 African Union troops have been put in place to protect the people of Darfur. While I believe the African Union force is better than nothing, their troop numbers are clearly too small. They are underfunded, underequipped, and lack a mandate to protect civilians. I agree with many of the experts who have said that we need to at least triple the size of the African Union force as a bridge until we can get a U.N. force operational in Darfur. I also think the President and others have the right idea of using NATO forces to provide logistical support while letting countries with Muslim populations take the lead on the ground.

Of course, we face some obstacles to getting a U.N. force into the Sudan and controlling the situation. First, the Chinese continuously stand in the way of the United Nations. Let's make it simple: The Chinese buy oil from the Sudanese, and they don't want to stop.

In fact, China, because of its rule that it doesn't involve itself in any way in the domestic affairs of other countries, has no problem buying oil from a government committing genocide in the Sudan. Then there is the issue of Osama bin Laden, who has denounced the idea of U.N. troops and in his most recent audiotape broadcast called on Muslims to fight such a force.

In the past, some steps have been taken on the part of the United States and the international community to address the crisis in Darfur, but the violence continues. Congress has appropriated funds for African Union peacekeeping, food aid, and support for refugees. The United Nations Security Council has passed various resolutions raising concerns about war crimes committed in Darfur. The Government of Sudan and the two rebel groups involved are now in negotiations, and I know that Deputy Secretary of State Zoellick is there now trying to reach a final agreement with the rebels. Yet, despite all of these measures, the sad truth remains that the people of Darfur face a bleak future of uncertainty, suffering, and death. It is time that we take additional action to stop the genocide in the Sudan.

That is why this amendment that I have had other colleagues join me in would provide \$60 million to support U.N. peacekeeping in Darfur. I certainly wish to thank the cosponsors of this amendment—Senators LEAHY, DURBIN, SARBANES, DODD, OBAMA, LAUTENBERG, WYDEN, and STABENOW—for their support and for their efforts.

The African Union troops in Darfur are clearly overwhelmed by the challenge at hand. This amendment would provide critical funding to equip international troops and restore law and order to the region of Darfur. Although the intervention of U.N. troops has not been authorized, this amendment would assure that when it is accomplished, the money is there, and it will increase pressure on the African Union, the Khartoum Government, and the international community to make sure that a U.N. force is put in place in Darfur.

For those who would question the amount—even though it is now offset—proposed in this amendment, I would like to point out that my amendment adds the same level of funding to the Contributions for International Peacekeeping account that has already been approved in the House supplemental appropriations bill. There is no other way to get these funds to protect the people of Darfur. They are not in the current funds appropriated for fiscal year 2006. I think we can all agree that genocide in Darfur constitutes an emergency—an emergency to which this body has a moral obligation to respond.

Genocide is not a new phenomenon. We have witnessed this hatred and inhumanity many times over the past century. After the world learned the horrors of the Holocaust, America and

the international community vowed: Never again. Never again. After we saw the gruesome slaughter of approximately 800,000 Tutsis in less than 100 days in Rwanda, we swore: Never again. Never again, however, is an empty promise—it is an empty promise—if we do not take action to stop the murder of innocent people when we know it is happening.

Once again we find ourselves in a position to make that choice, and history is going to judge what we do—not what we say about never again but what we do when we have the power to do it. For even as I stand here today, I know the number of dead and displaced persons in Darfur continues to grow. Genocide is not Sudan's problem, it is not Africa's problem, it is the world's problem. It is our problem. And by failing to take part in the solution, we have become part of the problem. As Americans and as human beings, we have a moral obligation to help those who are suffering the consequences of genocide and who cannot help themselves. Now is not the time to forget that obligation, and history will judge us by the actions we take or fail to take in the next days as we move forward on this amendment.

Jan Egeland, one of the top U.N. humanitarian officials, has said, "Africa is the biggest drama of our time; nowhere else in the world are so many lives at stake as in Africa." Now is the time to act.

Some people might say that the fiscal 2007 budget proposal allocates sufficient funds to help the people of the Sudan. I would say you cannot put a price on human lives. Genocide is not a horror of the past; it is the reality, unfortunately, of the present. It is an emergency we must face today. The \$60 million this amendment offers will help put an end to the senseless murder and displacement of the people of Darfur. If American lives were at stake, I am certain we would find the money to act. I hope we have both the humanity and the commitment to say "never again," to make sure that we do so in this case. Simon Wiesenthal said, "For evil to flourish, it only requires good men to do nothing." Let us act now to put an end to this evil.

I hope my colleagues will see that in the face of genocide, this is money well spent. I certainly hope we are permitted to respond to a moral imperative because history will judge each and every one of us for how we act in the face of the genocide going on in Darfur and in the Sudan. I hope that when it comes time for a vote on this amendment, the chairman will actually be able to accept the amendment as offset as it is now. I find it sometimes difficult to hear that we have a moral imperative, that we say "never again," and yet we put up roadblocks for fulfilling and responding to that moral imperative, and when we offer solutions to it, there are those who do not like the solution of offsets.

The bottom line is, if it were one of us—if it were one of us—thank God we